

REMARKS

In conjunction with the accompanying RCE, reconsideration of this application based on the foregoing Amendment and the following Remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter: Claims 9-14

The applicant notes that, as in the Office Action of February 26, 2003, the Examiner has objected to claims 9-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, the applicant has rewritten claims 9-14 into independent form including all of the limitations of intervening claims 1 and 5 for claims 9, 11 and 13, and intervening claims 1, 2 and 6 for claims 10, 12 and 14. Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Consequently, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to allowable claims 9-14.

The applicant has not abandoned the subject matter of cancelled claims 1 and 2 and reserves the right to file a continuation application directed thereto.

Prior to addressing the rejections over the prior art, the applicant calls to the Examiner's attention that the dependency of claims 3 and 4 has been changed from cancelled claims 1 and 2 to now independent claims 9 and 10, respectively.

The dependency of claims 5 and 6 has been changed from cancelled claims 1 and 2, respectively, to new claims 29 and 30, which are discussed below.

The dependency of claims 7 and 8 has been changed from claims 5 and 6 to now independent claims 9 and 10, respectively.

The dependency of claims 15 and 16 has been changed from cancelled claims 1 and 2 to now independent claims 9 and 10, respectively.

New claims 17 and 18 have been added which are analogous to claims 3 and 4 but which depend from now independent claims 11 and 12.

New claims 19 and 20 have been added which are analogous to claims 3 and 4 but which depend from now independent claims 13 and 14.

New claims 21 and 22 have been added which are analogous to claims 7 and 8 but which depend from now independent claims 11 and 12.

New claims 23 and 24 have been added which are analogous to claims 7 and 8 but which depend from now independent claims 13 and 14.

New claims 25 and 26 have been added which are analogous to claims 15 and 16 but which depend from now independent claims 11 and 12.

New claims 27 and 28 have been added which are analogous to claims 15 and 16 but which depend from now independent claims 13 and 14.

New claim 29 has been added which is an amended version of claim 1, which recites the limitation: --and only portions of said actuator spring and said base plate surrounding said pair of driving voids are laser spot welded.--.

Support for new claim 29 is found in the specification on page 24, lines 16-22, which discloses that in the second embodiment:

“the portion in which the actuator spring 8 and the holder arm 11 overlaps in the first embodiment is removed as shown in Figs. 6B and 6C and, when the actuator spring 8 is laid on the base plate 9 having the boss section 10, laser spot welding is carried out only on portions surrounding the driving voids 17 which are shown as jwelding points 20, as shown in Figs. 6A and 6C.”

Claim 29 therefore recites limitations which are supported by the specification with regard to location of the jwelding points 20. Furthermore, in claim 29, the limitation regarding the actuator spring and the base plate of “both of which overlap each other,” has been deleted.

New claim 30 is analogous to cancelled claim 2 but which depends from claim 29. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Claim 31 is also an amended version of claim 1, which recites --said magnetic head supporting section and said actuator spring being formed separately from one another,--.

Support for claim 31 is found in the specification on page 25, lines 15-20, which disclose the following with respect to the third embodiment:

“In the first and second embodiments, a load beam 4 constituting a fine actuator section 6 is integrally formed with an actuator spring 8 composed of one thin steel plate to obtain workability. In the third embodiment, as shown in Fig. 10, the actuator spring 8 and load beam 4 are separately formed and assembled independently.”

Therefore, claim 31 recites that the actuator spring and the load beam [, i.e., the magnetic head supporting section,] are formed separately.

New claim 32 is analogous to cancelled claim 2 but which depends from claim 31. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

New claims 33 and 34 are analogous to claims 3 and 4, but which depend from new claims 29 and 30, respectively.

New claims 35 and 36 are analogous to claims 3 and 4, but which depend from new claims 31 and 32, respectively.

New claims 37 and 38 are analogous to claims 5 and 6, but which depend from new claims 31 and 32, respectively.

New claims 39 and 40 are analogous to claims 7 and 8, but which depend from claims 5 and 6, respectively.

New claims 41 and 42 are analogous to claims 7 and 8, but which depend from new claims 37 and 38, respectively.

New claims 43 and 44 are analogous to claims 11 and 12, but which depend from claims 5 and 6, respectively.

New claims 45 and 46 are analogous to claims 11 and 12, but which depend from new claims 37 and 38, respectively.

New claims 47 and 48 are analogous to claims 13 and 14, but which depend from new claims 5 and 6, respectively.

New claims 49 and 50 are analogous to claims 13 and 14, but which depend from new claims 37 and 38, respectively.

New claims 51 and 52 are analogous to claims 15 and 16, but which depend from new claims 29 and 30, respectively.

New claims 53 and 54 are analogous to claims 15 and 16, but which depend from new claims 31 and 32, respectively.

Therefore, no new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the claims.

The foregoing Amendment and Remarks establish the patentable nature of all of the claims rejected and objected to which remain in the application, i.e., claims 3-16. New claims 17-54 have been added. No new matter has been added. Wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anthony N. Fresco". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Anthony N. Fresco
Registration No. 45,784

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343/4366 FAX

ANF:yd